DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 305 EA 020 059

AUTHOR Hossler, Don; And Others
TITLE An Investigation of the Knowledge Claims Supporting Goal Based Planning and Organizational Culture as Keys to Excellence in Educational Organizations.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 79p.; Study supported by the Profitt Fund, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Management by Objectives; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Contingency Theories

ABSTRACT

Two independent bodies of organizational theory and research are developing around separate concepts associated with organizational effectiveness: goal-based behavior (intention) and organizational climate (distinction). Although both variables have been found to influence organizational effectiveness, findings have been inconsistent. The term "intention" is associated with goal-based planning, such as goal-setting, management by objectives, strategic planning, and performance budgeting systems. Intention directs organizational activity toward desired goals and is solidly rooted in the positivist paradigm exemplified in the works of Taylor and Weber. The intellectual origins of distinction are more recent and arise from anthropology and the sociology of knowledge, which views all human collectives as voluntary associations influenced by cultural and other factors idiosyncratic to individual members of organizations. Employing a set of qualitative meta-analytical techniques, this paper examines the relationship among intention, distinction, and organizational effectiveness. Data sources include quantitative research, case studies, and theoretical literature. Results show little empirical evidence to support the efficacy of either intention- or distinction-based management strategies. A complementary relationship may exist between intention and distinction, but more research is needed. Also, it is unclear whether distinction can be managed. Recommendations are provided for managers and researchers frustrated by these results. Included is a bibliography of 71 references and 2 appendices. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Don Hossler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED295305

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE CLAIMS SUPPORTING GOAL BASED PLANNING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AS KEYS TO EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Don Hossler
Patrick Love
Jill Carnaghi
Jack Schmit
Elizabeth Whitt

Indiana University
Higher Education and Student Affairs

Paper was funded by the Proffitt Fund administered by the School of Education at Indiana University. This study should not to be quoted without permission of the authors.

EA020059

Abstract

Two independent bodies of organizational theory and research are developing around the concepts of goal-based or prospective planning, called intention on the one hand, and organizational culture or perspectival interpretation of what works, called distinction, on the other. Both of these variables have been found to influence organizational effectiveness, the findings, however, have been inconsistent. Intention and distinction each have been shown to have positive, negative, or no effect on organizational effectiveness.

Employing a set of qualitative meta-analytic techniques, this study compares knowledge claims on the impact of intention and distinction upon organizational effectiveness. The relationship between intention and distinction, separate from the outcome variable, is also analyzed to determine whether the intention and distinction are mutually reinforcing, unrelated, or negatively related. Data sources include quantitative research, case studies, and theoretical literature. Data from these three literature sources are triangulated to determine the strength and effects of intention and distinction upon organizational effectiveness.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE CLAIMS SUPPORTING INTENTION AND DISTINCTION AS KEYS TO EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Two independent bodies of organizational theory and research in education are developing around the contribution of two separate concepts to organizational effectiveness: (1) goal-based behavior - intention and (2) organizational climate, culture, etc. - distinction. This paper will examine the relationship between intention, distinction, and organizational effectiveness.

Proponents of the importance of either intention, or distinction, suggest that each is a determinant of organizational effectiveness. Intention (goal-based behavior) is asserted to be an important determinant of organizational effectiveness, that is goal setting enables an organization to achieve desired states. On the other hand, advocates of distinction suggest that distinction (e.g. organizational culture, climate, etc.), through consensual informal control mechanisms determine organizational effectiveness. Intention and distinction are meta-concepts that incorporate a number of existing concepts. Since these meta-concepts are new, they will briefly be defined and reviewed in the introduction of this paper. More complete definitions and discussions of intention and distinction, along with organizational effectiveness are presented later in this paper.

The term intention, taken from Clark and Astuto (1986), is a meta-concept which captures multiple terms associated with goal-based planning such as goal setting, management by objectives

(MBO), strategic planning and performance budgeting systems. Intention can be defined as prospective planning which directs the activities of organizations toward a set of desired states. Intention assumes the existence of supraordinate goals that drive functional units within an organization, or the entire organization. The works of Taylor (scientific management) and Weber (organizational bureaucracies) are classic examples of intention and are rooted in the positivist paradigm. This paradigm advances a belief in the rationality of organizations. The positivist paradigm, when applied to organizations, asserts that managers can control (or at least greatly influence) organizational outcomes independent of the external environment. This control is accomplished through the use of planning and goal-setting.

Distinction is also a meta-concept which includes such terms as organizational culture, organizational climate, and organizational philosophy. The origins of distinction are more recent and can be found in the works of Barnard, Berger and Luckmann, Geertz and more recently Ouchi, Schein, and Weick. The intellectual roots of distinction are taken from anthropology and the sociology of knowledge which suggest that all human collectives are voluntary associations influenced by a myriad of cultural factors, as well as other factors, which are idiosyncratic to individual members of organizations. Unlike the positivist paradigm, distinction is based on the assumptions of the emerging paradigm (Guba, 1985; Lincoln, 1985; Schwartz and

Oglivey, 1979). There are a number of assumptions that are important elements of the emerging paradigm, the most relevant elements for this study include: (1) events are the product of mutual causality, (2) that reality is complex and diverse, (3) and that the outcomes and meanings of events are perspectival, discovered through a retrospective and subjective sensemaking process after an event has taken place (Lincoln, 1985). Drawing on Berger and Luckmann's (1966) work on culture, our definition of distinction, includes assumptions that organizational distinction develops slowly, over long periods of time. Distinction can be defined as a shared set of values and beliefs that are derived from a retrospective sensemaking of past events and the current values of members of the organization. Distinction assumes that as the size of the organization increases there may be multiple groups within an organization which have a different shared histories and current values. As a result, there may be multiple pockets of distinction within large organizations.

When the knowledge claims for planning, MBO, and performance budgeting are aggregated under the concept of intention, this position asserts that prospective goal-setting activities will result in the achievement of desired organizational states. That is, intention is positively related some specified measure of organizational effectiveness. The accumulated literature organizational culture, climate and philosophy - distinction - represent the other position that will be examined in this

investigation. The literature on distinction indicates that a shared sense of values, of purpose, a consensual understanding of "the way we do things around here," are related to organizational effectiveness.

Both intention and distinction are believed to be critical variables affecting organizational effectiveness. Advocates of each position either diminish the significance of the other or note that they are complementary, e.g., culture is manipulated to reinforce goals, goal consensus is a necessary condition to support strong organizational culture. In fact, these two concepts may be complementary, they may be unrelated or they may be in conflict.

Intention and Distinction

Goal-based planning is a truism of educational managerial training and practice (Clark and Astuto, 1986). Organizations have often been defined as goal attaining entities (Etzioni, 1964). An entire technology of administration is built around the acceptance of the notion that "you can't get there if you don't know where you are going." Such thinking has resulted in the development of management by objectives, program planning and budgeting systems, strategic planning, planned change strategies, and "rational governance systems." A substantial body of organizational studies have accumulated around goal-setting and planning as independent variables with some definition of organizational effectiveness as the dependent variable. The acceptance of the role of goals in organizational literature is

reflected in what is perhaps the best of the current crop of texts in organizational theory:

> Goals represent the reason for an organization's existence. An organization is a goal-attainment device. Without some purpose, there is no need for the organization. Goals summarize and articulate that purpose. Daft, 1986, p. 93

and

> Understanding organizational goals is the first step toward understanding organizational effectiveness... Goals were defined earlier as the desired future state of the organization. Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization realizes its goals. pp. 101-102

However, the role of goals in organizations has been challenged by some organizational theorists (Boje, Fedor, and Rowland, 1982; Georgiou, 1973; Weick, 1979). Fifteen years ago, Georgiou noted, after reviewing the organizational literature:

> ...almost invariably, studies demonstrate the fruitlessness of understanding organizations as goal attaining entities. The paradigm retains its primacy not because of the insights it yields, but because it is embedded so deeply in our consciousness that it is a reality rather than a theoretical construct to be discarded when it ceases to enlighten. 1973, p. 292

And Weick (1979) challenged the utility of goals in his discussion of the role of goals in organizations:

> The common assertion that people organize in order to accomplish some agreed-upon end is not essential to an explanation of the orderliness found in concerted action... It is probable that goals are tied more closely to actual activities than is commonly recognized and that they are more properly understood as summaries of previous actions. p. 239

Thus, the challenge to goal-based planning by some leading theorists of organizations questions some of the basic assumptions of the positivist paradigm when applied to organizational theory. They argue that action normally precedes intent; that operative goals are discovered through action and are translated retrospectively into informal organizational goal statements (Clark and Astuto, 1986; March, 1972; Weick, 1985) . This non-orthodox view of organizations describes institutions as discovering their distinction through acting, doing, and responding to their environment. Through a continual process of self-discovery, organizations "find" their distinctiveness. Finally, non-orthodox theorists contend that goals and goal attainment neither define an organization nor its effectiveness. The dichotomy is clear:

ORTHODOX THEORY Intention (Goal-Based Planning)	NON-ORTHODOX THEORY Distinction (Organizational Culture)
1. intent normally precedes action	1a. action normally precedes intent
2. goals are prospective states for the organization to achieve	2a. goals are retrospective interpretations of what works in the organization
3. goal-based planning has a positive effect on organizational effectiveness	3a. a strong organizational culture has a positive effect on organizational effectiveness

Counter-assertions and knowledge claims by the two theoretical camps have not been juxtaposed and compared. This study will examine these issues through a qualitative meta-analysis of the effect of intention (goal-based planning) and distinction (culture, climate, etc.) on organizational effectiveness.

With this introduction of this investigation, the next section of this paper will present the objectives of this study, it is followed

by a description of the procedures and methodologies employed to conduct the analyses. This will be followed by a review of terms used in this investigation. After the definition section, the findings will be presented in three sections. The findings will examine the three primary objectives of the study: (1) the relationship between intention and organizational effectiveness, (2) the relationship between distinction and organizational effectiveness, and (3) the relationship between intention and distinction (is this relationship complementary, unrelated, or in conflict). The last section of this paper presents recommendations to managers and researchers and examines and some alternative perspective which also sheds light on the results.

Objectives

The focus of the study will be on three clusters of literature and research results relevant to the knowledge claims about intention and distinction, i.e.:

1. Reports on individual quantitative studies.
2. Case studies including formal case research and descriptive segments of cases that appear in the literature.
3. Theoretical and taxonomic studies or treatises that support the efficacy of intention or distinction, for example the reference by Weick (1979) cited in the preceding section.

With this purpose in mind, three primary objectives are for this investigation are presented.

OBJECTIVE 1: To describe the relationship between intention and organizational effectiveness.

OBJECTIVE 2: To describe the relationship between distinction and organizational effectiveness.

OBJECTIVE 3: To describe the relationship between intention and distinction.

These objectives require a qualitative meta-analytic technique which brings along a set of technical difficulties. Most of these problems are procedural, i.e., defining the population of sources, defining the criteria of qualitative acceptability for inclusion, choosing the sample, and the analytic procedures. These are discussed in the procedures section.

Procedures

Population and Data Collection:

The population of the study includes quantitative research, case studies, and the theoretical literature regarding intention and distinction. A thesaurus was constructed based on the analysis and classification of related concepts drawn from comprehensive reviews of the literature on distinction and intention. This thesaurus was used to develop a bibliography of books and monographs, journal articles, papers, and fugitive empirical studies (both qualitative and quantitative) for inclusion in the literature which comprised the population for this study. In addition, it was used as the point of entry for computerized search and retrieval data bases, including all potentially relevant sources in business (ABI/Inform), education (ERIC), and public administration (PAIS and Social Scisearch), as well as dissertation abstracts in business, education and public administration.

The criteria used to select a sample for analysis varied according to the type of literature. General criteria included: seminal sources (e.g. Kondrasuk, 1981; Ouchi and Wilkins, 1985), frequency of citations in high status sources, and the redundancy of findings. In addition to the general criteria, the empirical studies were also evaluated on the basis of design features, adequate sampling procedures, appropriate analyses, and assessments of the quality of the publication/journal. The theoretical literature was selected on the basis of clarity, the impact of the work on research in the field, the use of citations to support positions of advocacy, and assessments of quality of the publication/journal.[1]

The theoretical literature was included for two reasons. First, it has influenced the research questions being asked about intention and distinction and, therefore, has played an important role in shaping the knowledge claims regarding both concepts. In addition, research in organizational distinction has only recently emerged and a substantial portion of the literature on this topic is theoretical or propositional in nature. A review of theoretical work frames the discussion of both distinction and intention.

Meta-Analytic Techniques:

Because of diverse terms used to define factors of intention, distinction and effectiveness and because we analyzed quantitative, qualitative, and theoretical literature, quantitative meta-analytic techniques such as those of Glass (1978) could not be employed.

[1] Criteria for quality assessments are discussed in more detail later in the procedures section and can be found in Appendices A through E.

Instead, three similar, but separate, survey instruments based on the case study analytic technique outlined by Yin and Heald (1975) were developed. This technique required the investigators to ask a series of open ended questions of each data source which resulted in a coding sheet for each source. Utilizing a qualitative meta-analysis produced a form of content analysis through which the presence and the intensity of common characteristics, events, and outcomes were distilled. Each literature source included in this study was assigned a high, medium or low quality rating based upon pre-determined criteria established by the investigators (see Appendices D-F). This enabled us to attach more importance to high quality sources. This approach is similar to that of Slavin (1986) who suggests that meta-analytic techniques should rely more heavily on high quality studies.

Separate survey instruments were developed for each of the three types of literature. In order to permit comparisons, however, the instruments had to be similar (see Appendices A, B, and C). All three instruments captured demographic information about the data sources, including: the author, the purpose of the article, and the publication date. Assessments of the quality of each source were also recorded. The instruments also gathered information about the types of organizations studied (education, manufacturing, non-profit, for profit service, etc.). In addition, assessments were made about the complexity of the organization(s) being studied. Organizations were classified as complex or simple on the basis of the complexity of their technologies (banking vs. logging), the degree of goal

ambiguity (sales vs. teaching), the clarity of their feedback mechanisms (sales vs. health care), and the degree of education required by employees (assembly line work vs. research). Findings, or assertions, regarding organizational effectiveness were tracked for all three literature sources as were findings related to distinction and intention. Recommendations for policy makers, practitioners, and researchers were recorded.

For the theoretical coding sheets, we looked for the disciplinary perspective of the source (anthropology, organizational theory, or sociology for example). The case study coding sheets captured descriptive information about the type of case study that was used (e.g. multiple organizations in one study). The quantitative coding sheets asked specific methodological and design questions (experimental, field study, correlational, etc.).

Data Analysis:

The data were disaggregated into six cells. These included:

1. The effects of intention-based interventions (i.e. planned change strategies, MBO, etc.) upon organizational effectiveness;
2. The effects of distinction-based interventions (i.e. culture manipulation, organizational climate, etc.) upon organizational effectiveness;
3. The relationship between distinction and intention; are they positively related, negatively related, or unrelated?
4. The effects of other organizational variables (e.g. organizational complexity, size, external environment) on intention;
5. The effects of other organizational variables (e.g. organizational complexity, size, external environment) on distinction;

6. Other factors related to intention and distinction which may look interesting, but the sample population does not make these relationships clear.

Each effect was summarized for each data source. That is, questions were asked such as: what propositions or generalizations can be supported about the effects of intention on productivity from quantitative studies, case studies, and do empirical sources support or conflict with the theoretical literature? This process of triangulation (Issac and Michael, 1984) has been employed to generate generalizations across data sources.

For each data source, there were specific concerns generated by the data analysis. For example, the quality of the theoretical sources varied. Forty percent of the sources were judged to be of high quality. Thirty percent were judged to be of medium quality and 30% of low quality. Only the medium and high quality sources are reported in this study. The theoretical sources were general in focus and, for the most part, their applicability was not limited to specific types of organizations (e.g., schools, manufacturing). In the theoretical literature there were assertions made which appeared to be contradictory. For example, Deal and Kennedy (1982) assert the importance of organizational culture. They go on to describe how culture can be managed. Other theorists (Schein, 1985: Ouchi and Wilkins, 1986), however, argue that cultures develop slowly which seems to negate assertions that culture can be managed.

Most of the case study sources (68%) were of medium quality. Only one case study was classified as being of low quality and 29% were judged to be of high quality. Almost all of the case studies were

drawn from education including elementary and secondary, as well as higher education. Twenty-eight percent of the case studies described an intervention for a single organization. The remaining 13% of the cases included descriptions of multiple organizations.

In general, the case studies had several weaknesses. Frequently the author(s) neglected to indicate if they were writing from the perspective of a participant, consultant, objective observer, or any combination thereof. The time spans over which the case studies were conducted was not always indicated. Most case studies included interviews and observations, with the addition of surveys and archival information in some instances. At times, however, the sources of data were unclear. In addition, the researchers could not always ascertain whether the case study was developed after the event or intervention had taken place (and as such was an example of retrospective sense making) or whether it had been recorded as the events took place. Finally, in some case studies the actual outcomes of the interventions were not clearly described.

Generally, researchers using quantitative methods did a better job of documenting their procedures. This resulted in more studies judged to be of high quality. Forty-eight percent of the sources were rated as high in quality, 31% as medium and 21% as low. These data sources covered a wide range of organizational types including logging operations, sales, manufacturing, banks, hospitals, K-12 schools and school districts, and colleges and universities. The quantitative studies were more likely to study an organization for shorter time spans (12 months or less in most studies) - this was

viewed as a shortcoming of the quantitative studies. A full range of designs were employed in the quantitative studies we reviewed, including descriptive survey research, correlational and causal-correlational studies, cross-sectional and longitudinal designs, and quasi-experimental and experimental designs.

The most frequent problem with the quantitative literature was imprecise specification of the criteria for judging effectiveness. Frequently a study would assert that after the use of an intentional intervention that employees had a clearer sense of the goals of the organization, or that "75% of all CEOs report the use of MBO," but there would be no indication as to how, or even whether, goal clarity had actually been measured, whether MBO was actually in use, or how long the effects of the intervention lasted. In general, these sources reported the most exacting and clear relationships between the variables being investigated. Unlike the case study sources, however, they lacked the thick description that provided detailed information about the context of the intervention and which helped us to assess the internal validity of the studies.

Issues of Definition

Definitions of intention and distinction were presented in overview section of this paper. In this section, terms included within the constructs of intention and distinction are more fully defined. In addition, various definitions of effectiveness which were used in the literature sources analyzed in this study are examined.

Definitions of Intention:

Clark and Astuto (1986) define intention as prospective goal-based planning. That is, intention implies that intent precedes action and that the success of an organization depends upon goal attainment. We initially classified terms such as: goal setting, management by objectives (MBO), planned change, budget planning systems (PPBS, zero based budgeting, etc.), and rational leadership activities as terms subsumed under the meta-concept of intention. Definitions for each these terms include:

1. goal setting - A goal has been defined as what a person is "consciously attempting to accomplish" (Latham and Yukl, 1975). The premise of goal setting is that the individual's conscious goal setting intentions regulate his or her actions. Hard, but attainable, goals lead to greater performance than does the admonition "to do your best," or no goal at all (Locke, 1968).

2. MBO - A technique that features...joint goal-setting between those at each level of management and those at the next level higher, the expression of objectives whenever possible in quantifiable terms... the subsequent measurement and comparison of actual performance with agreed upon objectives. Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976, p. 1976

3. budget planning systems - Planning is an organizing process that brings together new ideas with future economic and social realities and answers qualitative as well as quantitative questions. NACUBO, 1980, p. 1

4. planned change - ...The managing of individual and group processes in an organization...The target...is to change the beliefs and attitudes of people. Hampton, Summer and Webber, 1973, p. 849.

5. rational leadership - Planned leadership activities carried out with the expectation that they will facilitate goal attainment.

Analyses of intention-based strategies include theoretical literature, case studies, and quantitative studies which rely on interventions defined in this section. Findings drawn from any of these terms are relevant to discussions of the broader concept of intention.

Definitions of Distinction:

Because the areas such as organizational culture and climate have more recently attracted the attention of organizational theorists and researchers, it was more difficult to determine what factors should be included within the meta-concept of distinction. There is a wide range of terms and concepts which appear to be related to distinction that are overlapping and not always clearly defined. The thesaurus that was finally developed included such terms as: culture, climate, organizational philosophy, myths, symbolic leadership, and subcultures (tribes, clans, etc). These terms were also utilized to conduct literature searches on distinction. Definitions of each of these terms include:

1. culture - A pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Schein, 1985, p. 9
   (a.) Subcultures - Subunits within a larger culture, which, although reflecting the major beliefs and assumptions of that culture, can be identified as a separate group due to some set of distinct or different belief(s), value(s), or behavior(s).

2. climate - The perceptions of the work setting... (climate) is concerned with the dimensions of an organization's current atmosphere. Enz, 1986. p. 3

3. organizational philosophy - A distinctive an respected philosophy that reflects value similarity among employees and the organization. Enz, 1986, p. 7

4. myths - A story that recounts purportedly historical events explain how traditions, major doctrines, and similar concepts arose in a society or group. Winick, 1959, p.

5. symbolic leadership - The role of leaders is to help interpret events and emphasize rituals and symbols to help provide meaning for the activities of organizational members (Sergiovanni, 1984; Vail, 1984).

Implicit in the concept of distinction is the recognition that the extent to which there are consensual values, an agreed upon way of doing things, or a clearly identifiable climate will vary from organization to organization as well as within sub-groups or subcultures of large organizations. All organizations have cultures and climates, however, the strength of both climates and cultures can vary. Therefore, we will refer to this variance as the strength of distinction found within organizations.

Definitions of Effectiveness:

Price and Mueller (1986) define effectiveness as the financial viability of an organization. They state that "this view is different from, but not incompatible with, the systems resource and goal achievement approaches to effectiveness" (p. 128). The researchers thus began with a definition of effectiveness that included the primary determinants of financial viability - financial stability, productivity, and the acquisition of resources. It soon became apparent, however, that this definition was too narrow. In fact there were more studies that used employee satisfaction (or a related concept such as turnover), or simply goal achievement as the

indices of effectiveness. Thus, the definition of success was expanded to include the following terms:

1. productivity
2. employee satisfaction
3. employee turnover
4. the acquisition of resources
5. the acquisition of power
6. level of innovation
5. improvement of MBO process (MBO becomes both an independent and a dependent variable)
6. successful planned change process
7. attaining desired goals

Thus organizations that showed increases in 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 or decreases in 3 were considered to be more effective than those that did not.

In each of the following three sections, analyses of (1) the relationship between intention and effectiveness, (2) the relationship between distinction and effectiveness and (3) the relationship between intention and distinction will be presented. The findings in each of these three sections will be reported on the basis of their literature source. The findings from the theoretical literature will be reported first, followed by the case study findings, and the quantitative results.

Analysis - The Relationship Between Intention and Effectiveness

Theoretical Literature:

There is a continuum of positions in the theoretical or propositional literature which describe the relationship between intention and effectiveness. At one end of the continuum are assertions that intention works, that it makes organizations more effective (e.g. Daft, 1986). At the other end of the continuum are assertions that intention based management strategies do not work, that they do not have an impact on organizational effectiveness (Boje and Rowland, 1982). Some of the most direct positions of advocacy for the relationship between intention and effectiveness can be found in Drucker's work on MBO (1954) along with the works such as those of Daft (1986). Drucker has stated that:

> The manager's action on present results, however, directly determines future results...Objectives are needed in every area where performance and results directly and vitally affect the survival and prosperity...They (objectives) spell out what results the business must aim at and what is needed to work effectively toward the results.
> Drucker, 1954, pp. 16 & 63

Such assertions about the efficacy of intention suggest that organizational effectiveness can be enhanced if managers identify appropriate goals for the organization and articulate these goals to employees so that employee activities are clearly structured towards achieving those goals. This point of view indicates a belief in a linear relationship between formally stated organizational goals and organizational performance.

Strauss (1972) takes a more moderate stance in his assertions about the relationship between intention and effectiveness. He

believes that intention links organizational goals with individual goals. This suggests that the importance of intention lies in enabling employees to find ways to link individual goals with organizational goals rather than top-down goal setting. Similarly, Levinson (1972) posits that intentional activities help management and employees to identify a set of shared values and goals. Richardson and Gardener (1985) assert that intentional processes reflect tension between the rational search for efficiency and a political process that facilitates the reconciliation of competing values. Each of these positions suggests that intention processes include some give and take between the goals of the organization (typically defined by management) and the goals of individual employees.

At the other end of the intention continuum, organizational theorists such as Boje, Fedor, and Rowland (1982) and Perrow (1981) assert that the relationship between goal based planning and organizational effectiveness is a myth. They state that planning is used by organizations that are having difficulty adapting to the environment as a means for making themselves believe that they are coping effectively with internal and/or external ambiguity.

Although their positions on the process of intention vary, all theorists, discussed in this section, except for Boje, Fedor, and Rowland (1982), assert the efficacy of intention. These assertions can best be characterized by the work of Lelong and Shirley (1985) who indicate that planning makes for better decisions, decisions that are more clear, more rational, more goal-oriented, less

political, are less short sighted, have more legitimacy and by implication create and maintain more effective organizations.

The continuum of claims about the effect of intention on organizational effectiveness are described in Figure One. This continuum will be used throughout this section on intention and effectiveness as a means of comparing the knowledge claims in the theoretical, case study and quantitative literature. In this way the theoretical literature provides a framework for the analysis of the case studies and the quantitative literature.

Insert Figure One about here

Case Study Literature:

Most of the case study literature about intention dealt with planned change interventions. The outcomes of the desired change included: new curricula, developing effective schools improved teaching, academic renewal, a merger of two universities, and improved financial viability. Generally, the case studies appear to support the claim that intention is positively related to organizational effectiveness. In all but one instance, the intention based intervention was deemed to be moderately successful to successful. However, the actual outocmes described in the case studies seldom matched the goals that were originally identified. That is because the goals of the intervention changed over time. In the case studies, this was the result of a variety of factors which will be described in more detail later in this section. The factors included:

1. external environmental turbulence (Chaffee, 1983)
2. lack of resources (Chaffee, 1983)
3. conflict among members of the organization (Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Heller, 1982; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Thompson, 1985)
4. inadequate planning (Thompson, 1985)
5. turnover among members of the organization (Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Messerschmidt, 1979).

The case study data describe a number of variables that bear on the relationship between intention and effectiveness. An important characteristic of intentional strategies is the opportunity for members of the organization to communicate with each other about the goals and achievements of the organization (Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Heller, 1982; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Thompson, 1985). In every case study in the sample, a key factor in the intervention strategies included group meetings of various types including subcommittees, planning teams and retreats. The importance of opportunities to meet and discuss goals and objectives supports assertion #2 in Figure One, i.e., that intention processes enable organizations and individuals to link goals.

Another element of intention that is evident in the case study data is the importance of diagnosis and evaluation before formulating goals and objectives (Alderfer, 1975; Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Heller, 1982; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Messerschmidt, 1979; Thompson, 1985). Diagnosis and evaluation have become the hallmarks of the current

literature on goal setting, strategic planning and rational budgeting systems. This emphasis upon diagnosis and evaluation reinforces the perception that the relationship between intention and effectiveness is a linear processes and as such lends support for assertion #1 in Figure One.

Rational leadership activities are also a component of intention. In the case studies the underlying assumption is that leadership activities can be characterized as intentional and as such they result in goal achievement and increased organizational effectiveness. Although the assumption is that rational leadership enhances organizational effectiveness the findings in the case studies are mixed. Several case studies identify organizational leaders as important in facilitating goal attainment (Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Lindquist, 1978), or in some cases leaders are identified as impeding the goal attainment (Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Thompson, 1985). It is, therefore, difficult to develop useful generalizations about leadership from the case studies. At times leaders who articulate goals and get involved in their implementation are identified as having a positive impact on organizational effectiveness. In other studies similar activities are seen as impediments to effectiveness. A change in leadership was sometimes viewed as slowing the goal attainment process because momentum was lost, in other case studies it was viewed symbolically as support for achieving the formally stated goals. Perhaps one conclusion can be drawn about leadership. Leaders need to involve

members of the organization throughout the intention process.

The findings on leadership does not directly support any of the assertions in Figure One. However, unless a posture is adopted which asserts that case studies are idiosyncratic and therefore not generalizable, the findings at least suggest that intentional strategies are complex and that the relationship between intention and effectiveness is not univariate. Seldom is there a one-to-one correspondence between the goals initially articulated in these case studies and the final outcome.

In sum, the case study data appear to lend more support for assertion #2 in Figure One, that effective intention strategies require linking the goals of the organization with the goals of its members. Viewed from a leadership perspective this finding is similar to Hause's Goal Path Leadership Model (Hause, 1971). This model posits that the role of a leader in group settings is to articulate organizational goals that enable members to link their personal goals to organizational goals. There is some support for a linear relationship between intention and effectiveness (assertion #1), but there is also sufficient evidence in the case studies indicate that assertion #1 is inaccurate. There is some minimal evidence to support assertion #3, the efficacy of intention is a myth. In one source intention failed, in several other case studies the goals changed. In each of these case studies, however, rather than challenging the assumptions underlying intention, the authors emphasized the participants failure to appropriately implement the goal setting process.

Quantitative Literature:

Whereas most of the case study sources which have been examined thus far have dealt with planned change interventions, the quantitative literature tended to focus on the use of MBO or goal setting. Only four sources used an intervention other than goal-setting or MBO.

The definitions of organizational effectiveness in order of their frequency of use included:

1. productivity/performance
2. increase in job satisfaction
4. implementation of an intention based strategy (e.g., MBO, goal goal setting)

<tie
4. the outcome variable was not specified

It should be noted, however, that measures for these effectiveness criteria were not identified in over one third of the quantitative sources.

This qualitative meta-analysis of the quantitative studies produced results which can be aggregated according to the four measures of effectiveness already described. When the low quality studies are eliminated, five sources remain that consider the relationship between intention and productivity or performance. In two studies which examine the effect of MBO on sales (Ivancevich, 1976; Futrell, Swan and Lamb, 1977), the researchers found that sales increased after the introduction of an MBO system. Ivancevich, however, found that the increase was of short duration. In one study of the performance levels of municipal fire departments, Coulter (1979) indicated that

intentional strategies had a positive effect on productivity of fire departments. This was measured by indicators of efficiency. Muczyk's (1978) study of multiple branches of a suburban bank found that intention had no impact on multiple economic indicators of productivity. Muczyk attributed those results to economic conditions outside of the control of the bank and to the fact that senior management was not involved in the implementation process at the branch level.

The evidence for a relationship between intention and employee satisfaction was also mixed. One study, (Futrell, Swan and Lamb, 1977), reported no change in employee satisfaction after the introduction of MBO. Another study (Ivancevich, Donnelly and Lyons, 1970) reported mixed results regarding employee satisfaction. Ivancevich (1976) indicated that employee satisfaction did improve after the introduction of MBO, but that satisfaction deteriorated after nine months and returned to pre-study levels after twelve months. Muczyk (1978) found that MBO had a positive impact on employee satisfaction, however, the increase in satisfaction was not statistically significant.

Four of the medium or high quality quantitative studies examined the implementation of an intention strategy. In one study, the process of implementing an MBO program was the object of investigation (Tosi and Carroll, 1973). In the other sources, the criterion variables were (1) the impact of intention on employee's attitudes toward the goals of the organization or (2) their attitudes toward a new performance evaluation system were

measured (Hollingsworth and Mobley, 1978; Meyer, Kay and French, 1965; Shetty and Carlisle, 1974). Tosi and Carroll (1973) found that the implementation of an MBO system resulted in: (1) greater goal clarity for the employees, (2) more negative feedback from managers to employees, and (3) more participatory goal setting. Although the latter findings appear to be contradictory, it may be the case that as goals and expected activities became less ambiguous supervisors were able to be more specific about acceptable levels of performance. Shetty and Carlisle (1974) and Hollingsworth and Mobley (1978) reported that the implementation of an MBO system had no effect on the degree to which members of the organization understood the goals of the organizations. Finally, Meyer, Kay and French (1965) found that the introduction of a new intentional employee appraisal system at General Electric had little or no effect on employee's perceptions of the evaluation process.

On the whole, the quantitative literature offers only marginal support for a positive relationship between MBO (intention) and organizational effectiveness. When the sample was reduced to studies of medium or high quality, there is an indication that intention enhances productivity, but only in organizations involved in sales. However, in one of the few studies (Ivancevich, 1976) the positive effects of an intention strategy were found to dissipate after nine months. This calls into question positive findings for any short term study. In more complex organizations (organizations where the employees had

higher levels of education, organizations that utilized higher levels of technology, etc.), intention had no impact on productivity. There is only slight support for the assertion that intention improves employee satisfaction, and only one study supports the conclusion that intention has a positive effect upon employee understanding of, or support for, the goals and performance expectations of the organization.

One of the most interesting findings of the current review of the quantitative sources is how little evidence there is to support the efficacy of intentional strategies. Of the 17 sources analyzed for this investigation, only 15 had interventions and/or outcome measures. Of those 15, the results of 8 did not support the original hypothesis and 2 reported mixed results which could be interpreted as supportive or non-supportive. In spite of the results, the authors conclude that intention works and then identify what changes would have been required to make intentional strategies succeed. Kondrasuk (1981), in his review of MBO and goal setting literature, also found very few studies that had clear interventions and well defined effectiveness measures that supported the efficacy of these goal-setting strategies. In fact, his review revealed that as the methodological sophistication of MBO studies increased, the findings with respect to the relationship between MBO and effectiveness, became more ambiguous. In Kondrasuk's study, an <u>equal</u> number of high quality studies found: (1) that MBO <u>did</u> improve organizational effectiveness; and (2) MBO <u>did not</u> improve

organizational effectiveness. Despite these findings, he aggregated the findings from case studies, as well as quasi-experimental and experimental studies and concluded that MBO works.

One indication from several of these studies is that individuals who are clear on what is expected of them (i.e. what managers think that the goals of individuals should be), or who understand what the organization's goals are, may be more satisfied than those who are unsure. This may be one of the reasons why there are mixed results when a formal system (in this case MBO) is implemented. If members of the organization are uncertain regarding what is expected of them it might be predicted that MBO, or any other approach to clarifying expectations would increase satisfaction. If the individual and the organization, however, have some idea of what they are trying to accomplish, then a system like MBO will probably have no impact, or actually reduce satisfaction because of increases in paperwork and forced justifications. In the section where distinction and intention are compared this issue will be addressed again.

Returning to Figure One, the cumulative evidence in the quantitative literature suggests that assertion #3 is the most accurate description of intention: the efficacy of intention, as defined in this paper, is a myth. The case study literature most directly affirms assertion #2, that intention works when it links organizational goals to individual goals. The frequent

alteration of goals and the consistent emphasis on the use of meetings to facilitate goal setting in the case studies supports that assertion that successful intention is a process of individuals linking their goals with goals of the organization. The conflicting conclusions from the two literature sources are not easily reconciled. In the summary section additional evidence will be presented which may explain these seemingly contradictory results.

Analysis - The Relationship Between Distinction and Effectiveness

Evidence concerning the relationship between distinction and effectiveness comes more from the theoretical/propositional and case study literature than the quantitative literature. There are fewer quantitative data sources on distinction, and those that exist are often descriptive, attempting to measure some of the basic properties of distinction so that further research can be done.

Theoretical Literature

Knowledge claims regarding the relationship between distinction and organizational effectiveness in the theoretical literature must be viewed along two dimensions rather then the one dimensional continuum used to describe intention.

(Insert Table One about here)

On the Y axis are three propositions advocated in the theoretical literature. One proposition is that effective organizations require high levels of distinction. That is, organizations are more effective when there is more agreement about the values, the organizational philosophy, and the way things are done within the organization. This position is taken by Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982). The second position, is best characterized by the statement that the high levels of distinctiveness are unrelated to organizational effectiveness. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) believe that culture serves as a control mechanism within organizations (clans) only under certain conditions. When no other competing control mechanism is present, when there is employee continuity, and when there is a lack of goal-path clarity, culture serves as viable organizational control mechanism. The assertions of Ouchi and Wilkins provide a contingency model in which a number of variables might influence the relationship between the strength of organizational distinction and effectiveness.

The third position is represented by Van Maanen and Barley (1985). They indicate that not all organizations will be distinctive and that in some situations (those requiring change for instance) high levels of distinction will actually produce negative results. For example, when the external environment is turbulent, the organization may need to change rapidly, however, a well entrenched organizational culture may restrict the organization from reacting quickly to the environment. This

position also seems to point to a complex relationship between distinction and effectiveness.

The second set of propositions regarding distinction, the X axis, contains more competing claims concerning the degree to which culture can be manipulated. At one end of the X axis, Deal and Kennedy (1982) indicate that culture can be managed. At the other end, Wilkins and Ouchi (1983) argue that culture probably cannot be manipulated. The latter position implies that organizations may be more effective if they attempt to adjust to their distinctive elements, rather than attempting to change them. Between these two extremes are a number of intermediate positions. Doyle and Seagren (1984) and Schein (1985) advocate a contingency approach to culture management. Doyle and Seagren (1984) are overly simplistic, describing a very rational model that advises managers to take the following variables into consideration: resources, the environment, management considerations, performance criteria, and elements of distinction (attitudes, values, and perceptions). Schein's (1985) contingency model is more complex. He asserts that the organization's stage of development - youth, middle-age, or maturity - will dictate appropriate strategies for managing culture.

Moving further away from approaches that indicate that organizational distinction can be manipulated, Vail (1984) and Sergiovanni (1984) advocate the use of symbolic leadership. They posit that organizational distinction can be altered over time by

leaders. The role of leaders in managing distinction is to interpret events and emphasize rituals and symbols to help provide meaning for the activities of organizational members. Symbolic leadership should be exercised in ways that highlight and reinforce goals and directions desired by the organization. In another section of his work, Schein (1985) also speaks to the role of leadership. He is less prospective in his approach then Sergiovanni (1984) and Vail (1984). Schein (1985) describes a shaping process in which the distinctive elements of organizations determine what kind of leadership will be successful, but which also acknowledges that leadership shapes culture over time. By synthesizing these theories, it would appear that attempts to manage culture might be described as a mutual shaping process in which the manager has some impact on distinction, but the distinctive elements of the organization also shape the behaviors of managers. This symbolic form of leadership is also similar to the goal path leadership model described by Hause (1971).

Case Study Literature:

The case study literature is a rich source of data on distinction. Even the intentional case study literature frequently reveal elements of distinction. The strongest relationships found between distinction and organizational effectiveness in the case study literature are: (1) the importance of providing opportunities for organizational members

to discover or re-affirm organizational values and traditions and (2) the symbolic role of leadership.

As previously noted, one of the intention processes that emerges from the case study literature is the importance of opportunities for organizational members to communicate, to meet and discuss goals and objectives (Chaffee, 1983; Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1979; Heller, 1982; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Lindquist, 1978; Thompson, 1985; Tornatzky, 1980; Valentine and others, 1985;). It appears that such activities enable linkages between organizational goals and traditions and individual goals. This seems to us to be an important attribute of successful intentional strategies in the case study data. Opportunities for communication among members of the organization are essential for these linkages to develop. Valentine and associates (1985), found relationships between the importance of communication in developing culture. They note that communication is essential for organizational culture to develop. Organizational culture, one element of distinction that is used in this study, reflects the importance of shared values and meanings and of rituals and myths within organizations. If the strength of an organizational culture (distinction) is positively, or negatively, related to organizational effectiveness, then opportunities for communication among organizational members are an important process in developing distinction and determining effectiveness.

The concept of distinction provides an alternative explanation of the importance of meetings and committees; they

permit organization members to discover or re-affirm common values and beliefs that are relevant to the effectiveness of the organization. When viewed from this perspective, committee meetings, planning meetings and retreats become opportunities for organizations to strengthen elements of their distinctiveness.

Examples of symbolic leadership are also present in the case studies. Symbolic leadership shows the members of the organization what is valued, articulates the philosophy of the organization and connects the past and present with a desired future. Case studies by Chaffee (1983) and Lindquist (1978) refer to the symbolic role college presidents and deans played by articulating a vision necessary for directing their institutions. In some instances, leaders connected the past with the future by showing how the mission (the historic past) provided a basis for a desired future. This approach also ensured that the leaders were perceived as staying close to the values of members of the organization.

Herriott and Gross (1979) and Chaffee (1983) also demonstrated how replacing key administrators can serve the symbolic role of emphasizing what the organization values. For example, when one of the college presidents in Chaffee's case studies (1983) fired several top level administrators and replaced them with new people who had experience and expertise, that action was interpreted by the rest of the campus as evidence that the president was serious when she stated she valued competence and knowledge.

Schein (1985), in some anecdotal case study material, and Ortiz (1986), found that leaders can play an important role in creating new images of the organization. Ortiz found that new superintendents altered the cultures of their districts by articulating what they valued and re-structuring the central administration to support those values.

Schein (1985), however, is more cautious in attributing organizational changes strictly to leadership activities. His case studies indicated that as organizational leaders began to learn more about the cultures of their institutions, they altered their management techniques to accommodate the existing elements of distinction. Thus, leadership activities and organizational distinction may interact to mutually affect each other.

In addition, to internal organizational culture and symbolic leadership, the culture of external groups with relationships to the organization also had an impact on effectiveness. Tornatzky, et al. (1980), Messerschmidt (1979), and Herriott and Gross (1979) discovered that the culture of the community in which the school district was located exerted a strong influence on the final outcome of planned change strategies.

There is also data from one case study which indicated that organizational distinction cannot be manipulated. Tornatzky , et al. (1980) described the intentional use of consultation and other staff development activities to alter the school climate of four elementary schools. Although all four schools did develop a more positive climate, in all but one case, the consultants and

other efforts to control or manipulate distinction were ignored by the teachers. This suggests that distinction cannot easily be directed or managed. It may also reinforce the point that leaders may need to stay close to the values and beliefs of the members of the organization in order to direct their activities.

The case study findings are more supportive of some of the assertions in Table 1. First, it appears that distinction is related to organizational effectiveness. The evidence suggests that managers attempting to enhance organizational effectiveness should take into consideration a number of variables including distinction. The case study findings, however, do not support the assertion that managers can control and shape distinction in a causal, linear fashion. Rather it appears that managerial actions are shaped by distinction, but that their actions also help shape organizational distinction. It is a mutual shaping process.

No findings have been presented yet to clarify whether high levels of distinction are required for organizations to be effective. The case study literature does not speak to this issue, but it is addressed in the quantitative analysis.

Quantitative Studies

The quantitative studies on distinction are scant. By the time the studies which simply describe some aspect of distinction are eliminated, there are very few quantitative studies of organizational distinction and effectiveness. As a result some research that is marginally related to the topic has been

included. As with other data sources, only studies deemed to be of medium or high quality were included.

The quantitative studies search located two studies which examined attempts to manage distinction to enhance effectiveness (Dumaresq and Blust, 1984; Kritek, 1986). Each of the field studies approached the management of distinction from the perspective of Cells 1, 5, and/or 9 - that distinction can be managed. Dumaresq and Blust (1984) used an improved school climate as their index of effectiveness. In examining a planned change effort in two schools, the authors found that, of the 26 climate factors they had originally identified, 6 improved by the end of the study and 20 showed no change. These positive outcomes included student achievement and self-esteem measures, indices of morale and staff relations, as well as community relations. The authors acknowledge that part of their results may be explained by the Hawthorne Effect, which in fact, was part of their strategy.

Kritek (1986) attempted to foster the characteristics of effective schools in 20 schools he had identified as "inferior". That is these achievement scores and school climate scores were lower than schools with similar characteristics. Implementation of strong leadership, high expectations, and frequent evaluation, resulted in improved reading and math scores as well as overall achievement scores. All schools, however, did not show large gains, but Kritek attributes this to higher numbers of transient and minority students. The findings of both

Dumaresq and Blust (1984) and Kritek (1986) support the contention that distinction can be managed to improve effectiveness.

There are four quantitative studies which address the relationship between the strength of distinction and organization effectiveness. Jobson and Schnek (1982), in a study to predict effectiveness of municipal police departments, found that the single best predictor of effectiveness was the level of support from the community. Officers felt needed when they solved and prevented crimes, and when the participated in community affairs. The authors interpreted these findings as an indication of the importance of the culture of the community on effectiveness. The crime rate was used as the index of effectiveness in this study.

Cameron (1985) attempted to determine if there was any relationship between three independent distinction variables and organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. The study used multiple indicators of organizational effectiveness that included student enrollment, degree of tuition dependence, balanced budgets, endowment, as well as other effectiveness indicators. The three distinction variables were: (1) type of culture (four types were identified - clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, or market), (2) the degree of congruence among these four types of cultures, and (3) the strength of the dominant culture. Cameron did not find any relationship between strength of the culture or culture congruence and organizational effectiveness.

However, he did find that the type of dominant culture was related to effectiveness. Cameron found that colleges and universities with clan cultures as the dominant culture were more likely to have higher effectiveness ratings. This should not be surprising. Wilkins and Ouchi (1983) define clans as socializing agents that govern exchanges:

> "in such a way that, though self-interested, they see their objectives in the exchanges as being congruent (not mutually exclusive), and by providing a general paradigm that can help to determine what is best for the relationship, the clan does not need to resort to close monitoring... it is predictable that colleges and universities would be likely places for clanlike cultures to develop... The clan is then able to be efficient in governing transactions under conditions of relatively high uncertainty and complexity. Wilkins and Ouchi, 1983, p. 471.

One of the reasons that Cameron may not have found any variance among the types of clans and organizational effectiveness is that all clans that develop must be effective in order for the organization to continue to exist. If clans do form in organizations, then they must be help to promote effectiveness or the organization would not be able to survive. Clanlike cultures rely on norms and consensual values to govern environments that are characterized by ambiguity and lack of clear feedback. This is an accurate description of most colleges and universities.

Using an experimental design with mock organizations, Pickett and Sorenson (1983) measured the effects of communication on culture. Although their findings are only indirectly related to the question at hand, they found that organizations with stronger cultures were created through increased communication. There is

some evidence that an organization with a stronger culture also fostered more commitment and member satisfaction, but the results were inconclusive.

Reynolds (1986) examined the differences among organizational distinction in three types of organizations: an advanced technology firm, a software firm, and a fast food chain. He found that each type could be characterized by different cultural attributes. Reynolds did not compare the effectiveness of these organizations so it cannot be asserted that one type of culture was superior (with respect to organizational effectiveness) to another . Nevertheless, he did compare "excellent" and "non-excellent" companies using one type of organization (advanced technology firms). When organizational position (the type of jobs that individuals hold) was controlled for, three variables were found to be significantly different among the organizations. The excellent organizations were found to have more loyalty, more cooperation, and a more informal atmosphere.

The cumulative evidence from these four studies does not convincingly answer the question as to whether the level of distinction is related to effectiveness. The only answer that can be given at this moment is that there is no empirical evidence to support any position on the Y axis of Table One. A persuasive argument, however, could at least be built for variability in the relationship between the level of distinction and organizational effectiveness. Berger and Luckmann (1966), as well as Schein (1985) assert that culture develops slowly over time. If the strength of

distinctiveness within organizations was a principal determinant of effectiveness, then only older, more established organizations, would be effective. New organizations would not have been in existence long enough to develop high levels of distinction. Yet there are many new organizations that rapidly become effective by almost any definition. This would suggest that not all effective organizations have high levels of distinction and that a number of contingency factors may determine the relationship between the level of distinction and effectiveness.

In terms of the X axis, there is virtually no support for the contention that distinction can be managed. There is also some evidence to support the assertion that distinction cannot be managed at all. Most of the data, however, appear to support claims that management of distinction requires a complex contingency approach or that managers and organizations mutually shape each other. It will be hypothesized in this paper that mutual shaping is the most accurate description of the relationship between distinction and organizational effectiveness.

Analysis - The Relationship Between Intention and Distinction

Thus far in this paper, the analyses of intention, distinction, and effectiveness have been kept separate. Only in the domains of leadership and the purpose and impact of employee gatherings have any relationships between distinction and intention been suggested. There were also some studies that explicitly used intentional strategies in an attempt to alter distinctive elements of the

organization (Ortiz, 1986; Tornatzky, et al., 1980) or that concluded that distinction must be taken into consideration when developing intention-based management strategies (Thompson,1985; Chaffee, 1983). The theoretical literature also contains assertions about the relationship between distinction and intention. Deal and Kennedy (1982), Peters and Waterman (1982), and Schein (1985) suggest that goal-based planning models can be used to alter organizational culture. Schein, although more conservative in his assertions about the extent to which culture can be managed, still presents contingency tables which suggest appropriate intentional strategies for different life stages of organizations. Schein also includes examples of organizational distinction determining which intentional management approaches to employ. He supports both the assertion that intentional strategies can be used to manage distinction and that organizational distinction determines managerial activities!

The theoretical works of Berger and Luckmann (1966), Wilkins and Ouchi (1983), Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) and aspects of Schein (1985), however, indicate that culture, and thus the organizational distinction, change very slowly, therefore, intentional efforts to manage distinctiveness are not likely to succeed - at least over short periods of time. This, however, does not rule out the possibility that managers could adjust to factors of organizational distinction and through the use of subtle leadership activities, managers might alter organizational distinction over long periods of time. Thus, the interaction of intention and distinction could

result in organizational change. In total, there is some modest support in the empirical and the theoretical litarature for both positions - that distinction cannot be managed, and that distinction is not amenable to intentional manipulation, at least over short time frames. Because the support for either position is modest, however, it must concluded that we know very little about the extent to which intention determines distinction or distinction determines intention, or that the two concepts are independent and do not interact.

Although very little can be concluded about the extent to which intention and distinction affect one another, there are data that indicate that their effects are complementary. One article used in this study became pivotal to an understanding of these two concepts. Chaffee (1984) used the case study method to examine the responses of 14 small liberal arts colleges to problems of student enrollment and financial viability. In her analysis, Chaffee described two categories of institutional responses. The first type of response she called adaptive, including increased planning activities, the implementation of new budgeting procedures, programmatic efforts to attract and retain more students, and adding new majors and new academic programs. All of these might be described as rational, goal-based, intentional responses to organizational decline.

Along with these adaptive strategies, Chaffee also chronicles a set of what she terms interpretive responses to the situation. The interpretive responses included: re-affirming the existing mission of the institution, symbolic acts by the president to affirm the

history and the viability of the college, involving the trustees and the faculty more directly in the governance of the institution. All of these could be described as distinctive responses.

In analyzing the efficacy of these responses, Chaffee found that all institutions employed adaptive (intentional) strategies to their problems. She found that those institutions that had employed only adaptive responses had successfully halted the decline and in some cases were beginning to recover. Those institutions, however, that had employed both adaptive and interpretive strategies had been more successful in their recovery. In fact, there was an inverse relationship between recovery and the addition of academic majors outside of these institution's traditional mission (they ignored their distinctiveness).

Incorporating Chaffee's work into the findings already reported, indicates that the effects intention and distinction are often complementary. That is intention-based strategies such as goal-setting often create opportunities for members of the organization to discover and affirm mutual goals in the context of the history and traditions of the organization. Intention-based strategies frequently appointed, as well as emergent, organizational leaders the opportunity to exercise symbolic leadership. Intention and distinction are complementary because organizational managers can sometimes influence organizational culture and climate. The findings, however, do not provide sufficient support for the assertion that managers can manage organizational culture or climate. Managers can and do influence organizational distinction,

but it is a process of mutual shaping rather than linear causality (intention) that leads directly to desired organizational outcomes. There is additional evidence to support this position. The dual functions of committee meetings, planning meetings, and retreats has already been described. Working together in groups may assist participants in clarifying their own goals and values thereby strengthening organizational commitment - and distinction. Heller (1982), in a case study, found that one of the purposes of committee meetings was to permit members of the organization to find ways of incorporating new ideas into their existing belief systems without having to change their beliefs.

Incorporating Chaffee's article into the evidence already accumulated suggests that the two concepts are at least complementary. Although distinctiveness may not be manageable, goal-based strategies, when used in conjunction with distinction based perspectives, may have positive effects on organizational distinctiveness. Chaffee (1984) also found that distinction and intention enhanced organizational effectiveness. The accumulated evidence on this topic is contradictory. However, if the evidence is aggregated it indicates that there is (1) a positive relationship between distinction and organizational effectiveness and (2) that intentional strategies appear to have a positive impact on distinctiveness and organizational effectiveness. It would seem that intention and distinction jointly may have a positive impact on organizational effectiveness. It is not axiomatic, however, that bringing members of the organization together will necessarily

increase the likelihood that the organization will accomplish the goals set forth by formal leaders of the organization. Shaw (1981) reports that cohesive groups are in fact more likely to develop their own goals which are not necessarily in agreement with the desired goals of organizations and formal leaders. The rub for managers is that emphasizing organizational distinctiveness may not move the organization in directions desired by manangement if the goals and values of the members are not consistent with the goals of management. On the other hand, if the organizational culture and climate is not supportive of the stated goals of the organization, intentional, linear strategies are also unlikely to be successful.

However, there is sufficient evidence to take a step beyond this and speculate that in many situations, intentional strategies may also be distinction-based strategies, but managers don't realize this. That is, intention-based strategies probably are more successful in influencing organizational distinction than they are in determining organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, it is simply unclear whether intention-based strategies have any direct impact on organizational effectiveness or indirect impact on effectiveness when mediated through organizational distinction. Intentional strategies may impact on organizational distinction, but there is little evidence to support assertions that intention enhances organizational effectiveness. A recurring theme in this paper is the lack of evidence to support the assertion that goal-based planning works. In most medium and high quality empirical studies intention does not work, or there are factors of distinction

also present. The distinction factors come primarily in the form of symbolic leadership activities and opportunities of organizational members to communicate with each other about the goals and purposes of the organization. In studies where MBO did seem to increase employee satisfaction (Muzcyk, 1978; Ivancevich, 1976) there was increased participation and increased supervisor/subordinate contact. In the two studies (Ivancevich, 1976; Futrell, Swan and Lamb, 1977) where an increase in performance was attributed to MBO, the increase could also be attributed to other factors. In Ivancevich district salespeople worked together to clarify goals. This aspect of the process may increase loyalty and commitment to each other and the organization and produce an initial impact on performance. Some other evidence that may indirectly support this hypothesis is that effect dissipated in the Ivancevich study after the people returned to the field. The lack of contact may have caused loyalty and commitment to dissipate along with the performance.

Using this alternative plausible hypothesis, most of the support for intention can be viewed also as support for distinction. At this point, there is some evidence to support a positive relationship between distinction and effectiveness, if the distinctive outcomes of intentional strategies (goal-setting and leadership activities) are incorporated. Far more research on this topic is required before such tentative a conclusion can be asserted to be a "knowledge claim," but there is sufficient theoretical and

empirical evidence to support this conclusion as a viable hypothesis.

Situational Factors:

In addition to our major findings on the relationship between distinction and intention, there are also indications that there are situational factors that may affect the nature of the relationship. Wilkins and Ouchi (1983), Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) and Schein (1985) suggest that size, geographical dispersion, and age of the organization may have an impact on the importance of distinction. Schein (1985) and Kirchner and Schuster (1982) indicate that organizations may be more likely to change under conditions of crisis. In crisis situations members of organizations suspend existing norms and procedures and search actively for "new ways of doing things."

There is also data to indicate that the complexity and level of ambiguity present in an organization may be related to the relative importance of intention and distinction. Two quantitative studies (Ivancevich, 1976; Futrell, Swan, and Lamb, 1977) which examined the effects of MBO on sales productivity found that sales productivity did increase. Both organizations studied were classified as simple organizations, because indicators of sales productivity provided direct and unequivocal feedback to organizational members. Conversely, intention had no impact on more complex organizations (Meyer, Kay and French, 1965; Muczyk, 1978). In addition, Cameron (1985) found that clan cultures were most likely to produce high

levels of organizational effectiveness among colleges and universities (very complex organizations).

At the moment these situational, or contingency, factors cannot be fully integrated with the previous discussion of the degree of complementarity between intention and distinction. Nevertheless, there are some findings from this study that would seem to form part of a contingency approach to the use of intention and distinction. For example, in the studies of sales oriented organizations (Ivancevich, 1976; Futrell, Swan, and Lamb, 1977), intention worked to improve sales. Thus organizational complexity appears to be one variable that affects the use of intentional or distinctive strategies. However, another possible explanation is a perspective that views these examples of successful intention strategies as examples of distinction. The goal-setting activities evident in successful intentional strategies actually enhance distinctiveness. If this explanation is accurate, then it would appear that distinction in less complex organizations can be influenced more quickly then it can in complex organizations. Of course, individuals with an intellectual commitment to intention could arrive at the same conclusion about the efficacy of intention. That is, existing studies simply have not followed the effects of intention on organizations over long enough time periods to discover that intention-based strategies eventually work over time.

An even more intriguing situational factor can be found in the work of Satow (1975) and Weiss and Miller (1987). Satow (1975) examines Weber's work on types of organizational authority. He

reviews the three types of authority that Weber discussed: rational-legal, traditional, and affectual. Satow indicates that Weber overlooked a fourth type of authority, value-rational, which Satow contends is characteristic of organizations that are dominated by professionals. The value-rational type authority he describes is based on "faith in the absolute value of a rationalized set of norms" (in Satow, from Willer, 1967, p. 235). Satow believes that the value-rational authority is subscribed to by professionals as part of the socialization process they go through during their educational training. This suggests that organizations dominated by professionals may be socialized to operate from an intention-based framework. Weiss and Miller (1987) would appear to support the idea of organizations that might be more supportive of one type of authority over another. They discuss the existence of ideologies that are the basis for the ways in which both managers and researchers conceptualize organizations, problems and decisions. The work of Satow (1975) and Weiss and Miller (1987) also have some similarities with the concept of subcultures discussed by Wilkins and Ouchi (1983). They posit the existence of four types of governance or organizational control mechanisms that they describe as subcultures: hierarchies, markets, adhocracies, and clans. Each of these rely on different internal and external mechanisms to explain the way the organization functions. Both Satow (1975) and Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) posit the existence of different subcultures within organizations, each of whose values and belief systems would support different apporaches to governing and managing

organizations. This would imply that different managment strategies are more or less effective in organizations because members expect them to work. These expectations create the reality in which members of the organization function. As Weick (1979) has suggested believing is seeing.

If the value-rational is an accepted ideology by many managers and organizational theorists it is easier to understand how the primacy of intention has dominated the way organizations have been managed and the ways in which organizations have been studied. The implications of this line of reasoning suggests that as long as the ideological authority of the value-rational dominates organizational thought it will be difficult to introduce managerial changes that incorporate distinction-based strategies. Given the increased interest in organizational culture and climate, however, we may be entering an era when the value-rational ideology is being replaced by a new perspective on organizations.

Purposeful Management and an Alternative Perspective

Purposeful Management

Although there are a number of gaps in the data gathered from this qualitative meta-analysis, the data can be aggregated into a number of overlapping clusters. These clusters are sufficiently strong to suggest another perspective from which to understand the management process. This form of management can be described as purposeful management. Purposeful management shares similarities with other non-rational theories of management (Clark and Astuto,

1986; Cohen and March, 1974; Huff, 1985; Weick, 1979). The word purposeful has been selected because it accurately captures the ambiguity of the management process. Managers, as well as all other members of the organization, typically have some purpose in mind when they act, however, the purposes are often equivocal - there are numerous desired states, the paths to the desired outcomes are multiple, and the meanings of the final outcomes are ambiguous and open to several plausible interpretations.

There is scant evidence to support the existence of a linear relationship between intention and effectiveness. If organizations are able to move in desired directions it is more likely because the members of the organization find enough overlap among their own values and goals to forge a set of shared desireable states. Organizations are collections of individuals, they have no goals other than those of their members. The goal-based paradigm works best in retrospect, when the organization evaluates its past goals, arrives at plausible explanations as to what they could have done differently in order to really achieve their goals (Clark, 1985; Weick, 1979).

When the existing research on both distinction and intention are merged, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that when organizations bring their members together in purposeful ways to discuss goals of the organization, communication takes place. This communication enables organizational members to link their goals with the goals of other members within the organization. Communication in formal settings enables new traditions to be formed

as well as existing traditions re-affirmed. Purposeful gatherings permit traditions and myths to be transmitted and the climate of the organization becomes highly visible.

Purposeful management also incorporates the concept of symbolic leadership. Purposeful leadership does not imply cause and effect relationships, but, based upon a retrospective analysis of what has worked in the past and an understanding of organizational distinction, purposeful management leads to the recognition that some choices will be more effective than others. That does not mean that the "right" decision will lead to a desired outcome, but it suggests that some alternatives will <u>might</u> be more satisfactory than others.

Through purposeful management, planning processes might still be utilized, even though they seldom appear to lead to more control over the budget, or the realization of long range goals. Planning processes are utilized because effective organizations require some purposeful means to bring people together to talk about their goals and needs. In a sense, intentional strategies really do work, but not for the reasons that managers typically think they do. Boje, Fedor, and Rowland (1982) are correct when they state that planning is a myth. What they fail to recognize is that members of organizations need myths and symbols if the organization is to survive. Purposeful management suggests that all decisions have a purpose, however, the problem is that managers more frequently make decisions on the basis of premises or preferences rather than specified desirable outcomes (Cohen and March, 1974; Huff, 1985).

As a result, even when decisions seem clear, attributing specific outcomes directly to the powers of managerial foresight is difficult.

Cohen and March (1974) indicate that most because of the complexity and lack of goal-path clarity in colleges and universities, most college presidents act in symbolic ways and emphasize rituals in their actions. In addition, they suggest that most decisions are the results of the random pairing of organizational problems and solutions. Both recognize the lack of direct relationships between managerial actions and organizational outcomes. The findings in this paper support both Cohen and March (1974) and Huff (1985). Perhaps the only significant difference is the emphasis on purposeful planning as a means of enhancing organizational distinctiveness. Enhancing distinctiveness gets at the heart of purposeful management. It does not assumes that distinctiveness will alwyas enhance organizational effectiveness. In fact, occassionally distinctive organizations will fail because they were unable to adapt to a changing environment. However, since there is so little evidence to support the efficacy of intention (except in simple organizations) efforts to enhance distinction may be all that managers have "got." Purposeful management also assumes that it takes time enhance distinctiveness, so that purposeful management is a long term management strategy. In the process of using this distinctive strategies, managers may well be more influenced by the organization than they influence the organization.

Huff (1985) concluded that most managers develop themes that guide their actions. Furthermore she indicated that most managers make decisions on the basis of general premises rather than specific goals. This accurately captures one attribute of purposeful management. Themes should evolve out of the distinctive elements of the organization, mediated through the perceived needs of organizational leaders.

Given the tentative nature of these findings, the following guidelines for purposeful management should include the following guidelines.

1. Managers should continually be looking over their shoulders, and looking in nooks and crannys to see what has worked in the past.

2. Managers should engage in retrospective sensemaking in order to make meaning of what they see from over their shoulders.

3. Managers should tap into the goals of non-designated leaders, they are probably closer to the actual climate and culture of the organization.

4. In organizations dominated by professionals managers should employ intention-based strategies in order to foster distinction.

5. Managers should look for themes in organizational outcomes.

6. Managers should develop themes, not goals.

It is premature to be too assertive in the claims for purposeful management. Given the existing research on intention and distinction, assertive conclusions are warranted. Until there is more evidence is this may be the best advice available.

An Alternative Paradigm

At the beginning of this paper intention was described as a example of the positivist paradigm. That is, that organizations are rational; if we study them carefully we can determine both organizational antecedents and outcomes. Therefore, most of this paper has reported the findings in an effort to determine whether intention or distinction (both antecedents) have an impact on organizational effectiveness (an outcome). The results from the meta-analysis suggests that it may be a mistake to use the traditional postivist paradigm to look for linear, causal relationships among these variables.

There is an alternative paradigm, however, that was alluded to in this paper when the position of non-orthodox theorists was described. This alternative paradigm is represented by the works of Clark (1985), Guba (1985), Lincoln (1985), Schwartz and Ogilvey (1979), and Weick (1979), who suggest that organizations are complex and diverse rather than rational and determinant, that they are managed in a heterarchical fashion rather than hierarchical, and that organizations are shaped by mutual causality rather than linear causality. In addition, the alternative paradigm suggests that people only make sense of the events around us after they have occurred (retrospectively) rather than by planning for them in advance (prospectively).

If managers and researchers adopt the non-orthodox perspective of organizations, many of the problems with definitions, as well as inconclusive findings seem less confusing. The multiple definitions

of effectiveness were found because investigators chose to define effectiveness as they wished. Opportunities for organizational members to meet emerged as important to organizational effectiveness because heterarchical organizations are characterized by "interactive influence, mutual constraints, and simultaneous interests" (Lincoln, 1985, p. 34) which can be linked through opportunities for purposeful planning. Symbolic leadership that is congruent with factors of organizational distinction succeeds because it acknowledges the importance of mutual causality; one cannot easily distinguish between the effects of organizational managers and members because they simultaneously shape each other.

The alternative paradigm provides a better frame of reference for explaining our concept of purposeful management. Purposeful management does not suggest that individuals can "purposefully direct outcomes," rather it asserts that managers can be a part of organizational distinctiveness by understanding what is unique about the organization and assisting members of the organization to continually re-affirm and discover their mutually restraining and simultaneous interests. In other words, managers can help to develop and maintain productive synergy among the members of each organization.

Summary and Conclusions

This study has resulted in a number of findings. First, there is surprisingly little empirical data to support the efficacy of intention-based management strategies. Secondly, there is even less

evidence to support the efficacy of distinction-based management strategies. When the knowledge claims of each concept are examined and compared to the relationship between intention and distinction, there is evidence to support the following conclusions:

1. There is almost no evidence of a positive relationship between intention and effectiveness.
   a. The evidence that exists is contradictory and as the quality of the research increases the evidence supporting intention decreases.
   b. Most of the research which examine the relationship between intention and effectiveness fails to adequately specify measure of intention and measures of organizational outcomes.

2. There is very little research on the relationship between distinction and effectiveness.
   a. Most quantitative and qualitative studies have attempted to measure or operationally define terms such as culture and climate.
   b. There are no studies which have found a relationship between the strength of organizational distinctiveness and organizational effectiveness.

3. There may be a complementary relationship between intention and distinction, but more research is needed in order to understand this relationship. To date most studies have ignored the relationship or assumed that distinction can be manipulated using intentional strategies. The results of attempts to manipulate distinction are inconclusive.

4. What little evidence there is to support a positive relationship between intention and effectiveness may actually be the result of distinctive factors inherent in "apparently" successful intentional management strategies.

5. It is unclear as to whether distinction can be managed. It appears that successful managers are shaped and in turn shape factors of distinction over long time frames. More research is needed on this topic.

6. There may be contingency factors such as organizational size, complexity of tasks, or age that are intervening variables in the relationship between intention, or distinction, and organizational effectiveness. More research is needed in this area.

Recommendations for Managers

Given the lack of conclusive findings for any of the original objectives of this study, managers should be wary of attempting to make any wholesale changes in their managerial styles. Employed with caution, managers should continue to use their intentional approaches, but with a new perspective, the distinction point of view. This may have two salutary results. First, managers may be less frustrated when their planning efforts seem to fail. Secondly, they may find real successes coming out of these approaches if they begin to use culture enhancement and renewed affirmation of the organization's philosophy as indicators of effectiveness.

In addition, managers should attempt to understand important attributes of distinction within the organizations they think they manage. Once these attributes have been identified, managers may be more effective if they attempt to adapt to the distinctiveness of the organization, rather than attempting to quickly change it. Also, managers should not overlook the importance of symbolic actions.

Recommendations for Researchers

The methodological recommendations for researchers that emerge from this study are lengthy. Researchers first need to look more thoroughly for alternative interpretations of their findings. In the intention literature, it appeared that investigators found just what they were looking for. On the surface, the quantitative methods appeared to yield more definitive results, however, definitions of the independent variables were so frequently absent,

as well as the absence of sound measurement of the criterion variables, that the results were often inconclusive. More importantly, the researchers seldom considered any alternative plausible hypothesis to explain their findings.

The case study literature about intention suffered from failures of the researchers to clearly identify their role in the study or the sources they relied upon. They typically neglected to consider alternative plausible hypothesis. The richness of the case study descriptions, however, were helpful in the search for all relevant factors. Future research should employ both quantitative and qualitative methods as a means of providing rigor, richness, and the ability to triangulate data.

In the distinction literature, the research agenda is also lengthy. Compared to studies of relationship between intention and organizational effectiveness, research on relationship between organizational effectiveness and concepts like organizational climate, culture, and symbolic leadership are just beginning to emerge. Although there are many theoretical works on these topics, there are few empirical works. In addition to the need for more empirical research, there is a more basic need to arrive at common definitions for constructs related to distinction. Currently organizational climate, culture, and philosophy are sometimes used interchangeably by researchers. The term organizational culture has been used in conjunction with terms including: myths, sagas, rituals, values, traditions, and ideology. There are few agreed

upon means for operationalizing any of these terms in ways that permit the comparison of findings across studies.

Another vexing problem in the distinction literature are the shifts in the conceptualization of organizational culture. Some studies discuss the relationship between organizational effectiveness and organizational culture as if culture were a monolithic concept which spans the entire organization (macro level). Other investigators examine subcultures within the organization (micro level). Frequently investigators will fail to account for the existence of subcultures or neglect to explain how subcultures relate to the concept of "a culture" for the entire organization. Still other investigators move back and forth between the two concepts without acknowledging the potential problems in doing so.

Many research questions are evident from this study. They include:

1. Well accepted definitions and methods of measuring concepts such as culture, climate, and organizational philosophy need to be developed.

2. Organizational researchers need to develop commonly accepted classification systems for organizations and use them in their research. It appears that factors such as organizational complexity and age can influence the determinants of organizational effectiveness.

3. We know very little about the relationship between organization effectiveness and the level of organizational distinctiveness, more research is needed on this topic.

4. Generally, we have assumed that leaders shape organizations, we know very little about how organizational distinction shapes leaders.

5. We know very little about how the goal-setting activities facilitate linking the goals of individual members of the organization so that "mutual constraints" and mutual "simultaneous interests" are discovered. This will require that qualitative methods be employed.

6. Investigations of intention and distinction need to more clearly specify interventions and outcome measures.

7. How do subcultures interact with the larger culture of the organization? How do subcultures that are in conflict with each other influence the organization? Can researchers really study the culture of large organizations or are subcultures more appropriate units for investigation?

8. The concepts of distinction and intention are potentially powerful constructs for analyzing organizational strategies and behaviors, however, both concepts need to be more fully developed.

High quality knowledge claims supporting intention and distinction as keys to organizational effectiveness are for the most part weak or non-existent. There is much to be done if both researchers and practitioners are going to enhance organizational effectiveness.

Figure One

Theoretical Assertions About the Relationship Between Intention and Organizational Effectiveness

Assertion #1	Assertion #2	Assertion #3
Organizational Management Set Goals for Organizations Resulting in Effectiveness	Intentional Processes Enable Organizations and Individuals to Link Goals Resulting in Effectiveness	The Efficacy of Intention is a Myth

Table One
Theoretical Assertions About the
Relationship Between
Distinction and Intention

	Distinction can be Managed	Successful Management of Distinction Requires a Contingency Approach	Managers and Organizations Mutually Shape Each Other	Distinction Cannot be Managed
High Levels of Distinction are Necessary for Effectiveness	Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4
The Level of Distinction is Unrelated to Effectiveness	Cell 5	Cell 6	Cell 7	Cell 8
The level of Distinction is Negatively Related to Effectiveness	Cell 9	Cell 10	Cell 11	Cell 12

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderfer, C.P. (1975). Learning from changing. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Boje, D.M., Fedor, D.B. and Rowland, K.M. (1982). Myth making: A qualitative step in OD interventions. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18(1), 17-28.

Cameron, K.S. (1985, January). Cultural congruence, strength, and type: Relationships to effectiveness. Presented at annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, IL.

Chaffee, E.E. (1983a). Rational decisionmaking in higher education. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS.

Chaffee, E.E. with Whetten, D.A. and Cameron, K.S. (1983b). Case studies in college strategy. Boulder, Co: NCHEMS.

Chaffee, E.E. (1984). Successful strategic management in small private colleges. Journal of Higher Education, 55(2), 212-241.

Clark, D.L. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory and research. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.) Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Clark, D.L. and Astuto, T.A. (1986). Paradoxical choice options in organizations. Unpublished manuscipt.

Clinton, C.A. (1979). Shiloh County: A matter of agendas. In R.E. Herriott and N. Gross (Eds.) The dynamics of planned educational change (pp. 215-235). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Coulter, P.B. (1979). Organizational effectiveness in the public sector: The example of municipal fire protection. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 65-81.

Daft, R.L. (1986). Organizational theory and design. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Doyle, K.J. and Seagren, A.T. (1984, March). A contingency approach to the management of innovation in a climate of contraction. Paper presented at a Pan-Pacific Conference: A Business, Economic and Technological Exchange, Honolulu, HI.

Dozier, J., Howard, S., Jenkins, R., and Williams, M.J. (1980). A planning manual for colleges. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Drucker, P. (1954). The practice of management. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Dumaresq, R.R. and Blust, R.S. (1984, April). School climate renewal: A longitudinal study of planned change strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Enz, C.A. (1986). The moderating effects of value similarity and company philosophy on the climate-commitment relationship. Unpublished manuscript.

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Filley, A.C., House, R.J., and Kerr, S. (1976). Managerial Processes and Organizational Behavior, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Firestone, W.E. (1979). Butte-Angels Camp: Conflict and transformation. In R.E. Herriott and N. Gross (Eds.), The dynamics of planned educational change (pp. 150-184). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Futrell, C.M., Swan, J.E., and Lamb, C.W. (1977). Benefits and problems in a salesforce MBO system. Industrial Marketing Management, 6, 265-272.

Georgiou, P. (1973). The goal paradigm and notes toward a counter paradigm, Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 291-310.

Glass, G.V. (1978). Integrating findings: the meta-analysis of research. In L.S. Schulman (Ed.) Review of Research in Education, 5, Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Guba, E.G. (1985). The context of emergent paradigm research. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.) Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hampton, D.R., Summer, C.E., and Webber, R.A. (1973). Organizational behavior and the practice of managment, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Heller, J.F. (1982). Increasing faculty and administrative effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Herriott,R.E. and Gross, N. (1979). The dynamics of planned educational change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Hollingsworth, T.A. and Mobley, W.H. (1978). Relationships among individual variables, organizational variables, performance and attrition in hospitals. Academy of Management Proceedings, 346-350.

House, R.J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.

Ivancevich, J.M. (1976). Effects of goal setting on performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 605-612.

Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly, J.H., and Lyons, H.L. (1970). A study of the impact of management by objectives on perceived need satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 23, 139-151.

Jobson, J.D. and Schnek, R. (1982). Constituent views of organizational effectiveness: Evidence from police organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 25(1), 25-46.

Kerchner, C.T. and Schuster, J.H. (1982). The uses of crisis: Taking the tide at the flood. Review of Higher Education. 5(3), 125-142.

Kondrasuk, J.N. (1981). Studies in MBO effectiveness. Academy of Management Review, 6, 419-430.

Kritek, W.J. (1986, April). School culture and school improvement. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Latham, G.P. and Yukl, G.A. (1975). A review of research on the application of goal setting in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 824-845.

Lelong, D. and Shirley, R. (1984). Planning: Identifying the focal points for action, Planning for Higher Education, 12(4), 1-7.

Levinson, H. (1972). Management by objectives: A critque. Training and Development Journal, 26(4), 3-8.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1985). The substance of the emergent paradigm: Implications for researchers. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.) Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lindquist, J. (1978). Strategies for change. Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press.

Locke, E.A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 157-189.

Messerschmidt, D.A. (1979). River District: A search for unity amidst diversity. In Herriott, R.E. and Gross, N. (Eds.), The dynamics of planned educational change, (pp. 74-111). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Meyer, H.H., Kay, E., and French, J.R.P. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. Harvard Business Review, 43(1), 123-129.

Muczyk, J.P. (1978). A controlled field experiment measuring the impact of MBO on performance data. Journal of Management Studies, 15(3), 318-329.

Ortiz, F.I. (1986, April). A comparison of leadership styles and organizational cultures. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ouichi, W.G. and Wilkins, A.L. (1985). Organizational culture. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 457-483.

Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Pickett, T.A. and Sorenson, R.L. (1983, May). An exploratory investigation of the relationships among organizational cultures, organizational communication systems, and member satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dallas, TX.

Price J.L. and Mueller, C.W. (1986). Handbook of organizational measurement. Marchfield, PA: Pitman Publishing Inc.

Reynolds, P.D. (1986). Organizational culture as related to industry, position, and performance: A preliminary report. Journal of Management Studies, 23, 333-345.

Richardson, R.C. and Gardener, D.E. (1985). Designing a cost effective planning process. Planning for Higher Education, 13(2), 10-13.

Satow, R.L. (1975). Value-rational authority and professional organizations: Weber's missing type. Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 526-531.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, P. and Ogilvey, J. (1979). The emergent paradigm: Changing patterns of thought and belief. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Cultural and competing perspectives in administrative theory and practice. In T. Sergiovanni and J. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice, (pp. 1-12). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Shetty, Y.K. and Carlisle, H.M. (1974). Organizational correlates of an MBO program. Academy of Management Journal, 17(1), 155-159.

Slavin, R.E. (1986). Best evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional views. Educational Researcher, 15(9), 5-11.

Strauss, G. (1972). Management by objectives: A critical view. Training and Development Journal, 26(4), 10-14.

Thompson, H.L. (1985). Considering a merger? Planning for Higher Education, 13(3), 21-26.

Tornatzky, L.G., Brookover, W.B., Hathaway, D.V., Miller, S.K., and Passalacqua, J. (1980). Changing school climate: A case study in implementation. Urban Education, 15(1), 49-64.

Tosi, H. and Carroll, S.J. (1973). Improving MBO: A diagnostic change program. California Management Review, 16(1), 57-66.

Vaill, P.B. (1984). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T. Sergiovanni and J. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and Organizational Culture, (pp. 85-104). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Valentine, K. et al. (1985, February). Understanding an organization through oral traditions: "No kinks, snakes, or whiners need apply". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Fresno, CA.

Van Maanen, J. and Barley, S.R. (1985). Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In P.J. Frost et al. (Eds.) Organizational culture. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Weick, K. (1979). The social psychology of organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weiss, R.M. and Miller, L.E. (1987). The concept of ideology in organizational analysis: The sociology of knowledge or the social psychology of beliefs? Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 104-116.

Wilkins, A. and Ouchi, W. (1983). Efficient cultures: Exploring the relationship between culture and performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 468-481.

Winick, C. (1956). Dictionary of Anthropology. New York: Philosophical Library.

Yin, R.K. and Heald, K.A. (1975). Using the case survey method to analyze policy studies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 371-380.

APPENDIX A
Conceptual/Theoretical Coding Form

Study Code_____ Reviewer _____ Date _____

___ Overall Quality:
___ Internal Validity:
___ External Validity:
___ 1. Study:

2. Stated Purpose:

3. Position of Advocacy:

___ 4. Conceptual Framework

___ 5. Method

___ 6. Factors - distinction and intention variables at work in the study.
___ a. Distinction

____ b. intention

7. Sample:
___ a. Type:

___ b. Complexity of Task:

c. Sample Size:

d. Time Frame:

e. other

9. Findings/Generalizations:
Implicit Explicit

Implicit (cont)

Explicit (cont)

11. Recommendations:
    a. Researchers:

    b. Policy Makers:

    c. Practitioners:

12. Terms for thesaurus:

___13. Hawthorne Effect? 1-yes 2-no
14. Additional questions:

APPENDIX B
Quantitative Coding Form

Study Code_____ Reviewer_____ Date_____

___Overall Quality:

___ Internal Validity:

___ External Validity:

___ 1.Study:

___ 2.Stated Purpose:

___ 3.Method:

___ 4.Other:

5.Factors

___a.Distinction:

___b.Intention:

6.Sample

___ a.Type:

___c.Sample size:

___ b.Complexity of Task:

___d.Time Frame:

___ e.Other:

___ 7.Organizational Effectiveness:

___ 8.Intervention:

9.Findings

___ a.Intrastudy:

___ b.Interstudy:

10.Generalizations

___ a.Implicit:

___ b.Explicit:

11.Recommendations

___ a.Researchers:

___ b.Policy Makers:

___ c.Practitioners:

___ 12.Hawthorne Effect

Additional comments:

APPENDIX C
Case Study Coding Form

Study Code_____ Reviewer_____ Date _____

___ Overall Quality:

___ Internal Validity

___ External Validity:

___ 1. Study:

___ 2. Stated Purpose:

___ 3. Case Study Design:

___ 4. Methods/Techniques:

___ 5. Other:

___ 6. Factors
___ a. Distinction

____ b. intention

7. Sample:
___ a. Type:

___ b. Complexity of Task:

c. Sample Size:

d. Time Frame:

e. other

8. Organizational Effectiveness:

9. Findings of the Case Study:
Distinction

Intention

Distinction (cont)

Intention (cont)

10. Generalizations

11. Recommendations:
    a. Researchers:

    b. Policy Makers:

    c. Practitioners:

12. Terms for thesaurus:

___13. Hawthorne Effect? 1-yes 2-no

14. Additional questions: